

From: Daniel WELLS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/7/01 11:14am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement that you have developed means that Microsoft wins. The consumer and especially small business (those with not enough clout to get concessions from Microsoft) loses. We urged the state of Utah not to accept the agreement and express our strong disapproval of the agreement you have reached with Microsoft.

Many IT departments are finding themselves having to use Microsoft products, not from choice, but because there is no competition. As architects, we need to be able to communicate the information we create with others (we would prefer that this communication and collaboration be done through industry standards rather than dictated by the creator of the desktop operating system). This makes Autodesk products (AutoCAD in its many flavors) almost the defacto products to use. Autodesk only develops for the Microsoft operating systems. They do this because Microsoft has a monopoly and has the vast majority of the desktops. It makes no economic sense for them (Autodesk) to do otherwise unless there is competition restored for the desktop operating system market. It is also feared that should the current settlement stand, that Microsoft will leverage their desktop operating dominance to further promote their server products and in the future make it very hard if not impossible to use a competing network operating system. Given the Microsoft track record on security (as evidenced by Code Red and Nimda) I would hate to be placed in that position. Microsoft is good at marketing and they are shrewd at business. They do not, however lead in innovation and stability of their products.

Daniel Wells AIA
Director of Information Systems
MHTN Architects, Inc.
801-595-6700
DanW@mhtn.com